## Remarks

### Abstract

A revised abstract is submitted herewith in which the number of words is confined to 150 words or less.

### Claim Objections

A period has been inserted at the end of claim 2 and claim 14 has been amended in the way suggested by the Examiner.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112

Claim 3 has been amended to recite that the computer software code is arranged to access information "about an identity of a caller at the originating terminal".

The dependency of claim 8 has been corrected to provide proper antecedent basis for "the access to configuration information".

Claim 10 has been amended to recite that the computer software code is arranged to direct a call to a voicemail system "associated with a called party at the destination terminal".

### Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that computer software code is added to at least one signalling protocol message. Similarly, claim 14 has been amended to recite that the processor is arranged to access computer software code "added to the received signalling protocol messages . . .".

This is described for example in lines 27 and 28 of page 9 of the specification.

It is noted that Arnold *et al* discloses a distributed execution environment in which no software code is passed between client and server nodes in the environment. Arnold *et al* merely discloses the passing of data and parameters between a client 302 and a server 316. The data is marshalled by a remote stub 310 in the client and is "unmarshalled" in a remote skeleton 322 in the server 316. Thus no software code is added to a signalling protocol message passing between the client and the server. Instead, only data and parameters to be processed jointly by the remote stub and remote skeleton are passed. This is described for example at column 6, lines 9-11, lines 17-19 and lines 29-30.

Furthermore, Arnold fails to disclose the sending of a signalling protocol message to the destination terminal from the originating terminal and fails to disclose control of the destination terminal by the originating terminal.

The thrust of Arnold, as explained in column 1 at lines 14-19, is to harness parallel computers to enable complex calculations to be performed quickly. Thus Arnold does not control the destination terminal but rather passes the remote computer part of a computational problem and subsequently receives the result. Thus in Arnold there is no need for a signalling protocol between the terminals since there is no desire to control the remote terminal as expressed in the preamble of present claim 1.

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 USC § 102 in connection with claim 1 is respectfully traversed. For similar reasons, the rejection of claim 14 is respectfully traversed since Arnold does not disclose a destination terminal of the type recited in claim 14 which includes a signalling protocol client arranged to receive one or more signalling protocol messages and a processor arranged to access computer software code added to received signalling protocol messages. Furthermore, Arnold does not disclose a destination terminal having processor arranged to execute accessed [added] computer software code so that the destination terminal is controlled.

The Examiner also has rejected claims 1 and 14 as being anticipated by Gio. It is noted that in the first full paragraph of page 5 of the office action, the Examiner has paraphrased claims 1 and 14 and in doing so has very significantly changed their meaning.

Gio discloses a graphical user interface to be operated on an Internet capable appliance which may be used to make or receive telephone calls. It discloses an article which is in essence a telephone which a large display screen which can carry out Internet functions. A "slidable" window may cover the Internet related functions displayed on the screen when telephone functions are desired to be operated. There is no integration between the telephone and Internet functions other than the use of a common display for control purposes. This is evidenced by the reference to US Patent 5,215,940 (see column 8 line 27 of Gio) which discloses the proposed apparatus for the Gio disclosure. US 5,215,940 discloses separate inputs (an analogue input for telephone purposes) and a digital input such as ISDN for other purposes. The telephone and data parts are separate.

Accordingly, Gio does not disclose any of the features of claim 1 or claim 14.

Accordingly the rejection of claims 1 and 14 over Gio is respectfully traversed.

The rejection of dependent claims 3, 4 and 10 is also respectfully traversed since in view of the comments above, these claims are not anticipated by Gio at least by virtue of their dependencies.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103**

The rejection of claims 2 and 5-9 over Gio is respectfully traversed for the reasons given above in connection with the anticipation rejection since Gio omits all features of the independent claims from which claims 2 and 5-9 depend.

In connection with claim 11, it is noted that Handley discloses only the notion of a message body in a SIP message. The portion of Handley referred to by the Examiner merely refers to the possibility of co-locating a location server with a SIP server. There is no disclosure of containing anything within a SIP message body let alone JAVA code. There is no incentive or suggestion in the prior art for the combination of JAVA with SIP messages as proposed by the Examiner and it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is applying impermissible hindsight in making this rejection.

Given the above and the attachment. Further and favorable reconsideration of the application is urged.

September 8, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 (fax)